

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 34, and 37 have been amended. The Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Amended claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 34, and 37 are in further compliance of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Consequently, any dependent claim not specifically addressed shall be in further compliance of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by virtue of dependency.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

In the Action on Page 22 the Examiner indicated claims 21-24 would be allowable if the above-identified rejection is overcome and indicates claims 3 and 9 would be allowable if the above-identified rejection is overcome and if they are placed in independent form. It is submitted that claims 3, 9, and 21-24 are now allowable.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13, 17, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Beasley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842. Beasley et al. is directed to a computerized switching system for coupling a workstation to a remotely located computer. The Beasley et al. system contains a crosspoint switch that allows input cards to transmit signals to and receives signals from up to eight of the remotely located server computers while each of the output cards transmits to and receives signals from up to eight of the remotely located workstations. Beasley et al. Fig. 4, column 6 lines 14-20. In contrast to Beasley the claims emphasize a switch to allow a terminal to connect to one corresponding private computer or to a public computer. Not the system of Beasley et al. wherein the terminal can connect to any of the servers. The distinction clearly shown in Fig. 1a and 1b of the disclosure where Terminal A KB-1 may only connect through the switch SW1 to Private Computer PC-1 through the gate a1

or to the shared computer through gate b1. Terminal A (KB-1) cannot connect through SW1 to Private Computer B PC-2.

In particular, as regards claims 1, 7, 13, and 37, Examiner cites Beasley et al. FIG. 2B, column 5, lines 39-52 and column 6 lines 11-29 and 43-57 as disclosing the "identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected to encipher a received key code." The terms encipher and encode are not synonymous in that the present invention enciphers data in order to hide its meaning from unintended recipients. Beasley et al. speaks of encoding but only as to the encoding of horizontal and vertical video signals to reduce the number of wires. Examiner cites FIG. 2B as disclosing encoding, but the cited reference does not state they are encoding a packet, but that the data is packetized, Beasley et al. lines 43-45. Further, Beasley et al. packetizes data for the purpose of transmitting the data from one workstation to one of many servers, not to conceal the meaning.

It is submitted that claim 1, 7, 13, 17 and 37 and claims 2 and 8 which depend from claims 1 and 7 respectively patentably distinguish over Beasley et al. for the reasons discussed above.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 9, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842 in view of Nelson U.S. Patent No. 5,675,653. While Beasley et al. is directed to a method of encryption, and discloses the use of bitwise rotation, column 2, lines 1-7 and further teaches the use of an enciphering key, column 5, lines 15-20. Beasley et al. fails to disclose the use of a terminal number as an enciphering key. Therefore, in light of the foregoing, claims 3, 9, and 21-24 are patentable as neither, Beasley et al. or Nelson, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified features of the claims.

Claims 4, 10, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842 in view of Wilder et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,675,653. Wilder is directed to a system to allow a terminal to connect to a plurality of servers through a KVM switch that allows the workstation to control the power to plurality of servers. In contrast to the present application and claims where there is a one to one relationship between a terminal and a private computer and no controlling of the power of a server. In the Office Action Examiner admits that Beasley et al. does not disclose a "whether or not a key code of a

predetermined key transmitted from any terminal has been received in a predetermined number during a predetermined period of time." The reference cited by Examiner column 2, lines 19-49, column 5, lines 54-64, and column 6 lines 28-35 does not disclose the limitation of the claims. Instead they disclose how "hot key" sequences are used to control the functions of the KVM switch. Moreover, Wilder et al., column 2, lines 43-46 discloses key codes not being received, wherein it states "keyboard and mouse data and clock signals from console keyboard 12 and mouse 14 are prevented from being passed to KVM switch 28 while the pop-up menu is active." Therefore, in light of the foregoing, claims 4, 10, and 25-28 are patentable as neither Beasley et al. and Wilder et al. taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified features of the claims.

Claims 5-6, 11-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beasley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,721,842 solely or in further view of Onsen U.S. Patent No. 6,473,811. As stated in the traversal of the 102(b) rejection, the references do not separately or taken together teach or suggest a method of "an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected to encipher a received key code."

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

8/28/06

By: _____

James J. Livingston
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501